



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/064,262	06/26/2002	Adeyinka Adedeji	08CN8824-4	1237

23413 7590 08/13/2003

CANTOR COLBURN, LLP
55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH
BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002

EXAMINER

SZEKELY, PETER A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1714

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/064,262

Applicant(s)

ADEDEJI ET AL.

Examiner

Peter Szekely

Art Unit

1714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4-5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The "up to about 50% diene monomer units" of claim 8, the "about 1 to about 80% polystyrene" of claim 9, the "1 to 7 carbon atoms" of claims 10 and 13, the "about 1 to about 15% impact modifier" of claim 14 and the "about 20 seconds or less" of claim 24 have to be inserted into the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims contain improper Markush language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burnell et al. 6,165,309, in view of Hellstern-Burnell et al. 5,294,654.

7. The rejections are maintained using the rationale of Paper #7 of the parent application, 09/539,067.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 6/26/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner is duly impressed by applicants' diligence in researching the examiner's past errors, however U.S. Patent 6,391,960 is not germane to the instant application. It is well settled that whether similar claims have been allowed to others is immaterial. In re Giolito, 530 F.2d 397, 188 USPQ 645 (1976). However, applicants' amendments are acceptable. Furthermore the rejections over Ostermayer et al. are withdrawn, since the reinforcing agents have to be present and all agents mentioned in column 4, lines 58-61, would cause opacity. The rejections over the Burnell references are a different matter. Firstly the fillers, as stated in the paragraph overlapping columns 6 and 7 and in column 8, lines 34-49 of the Burnell ('309), are optional, so including carbon black, clay, ZnO and ZnS into the formulation is clearly erroneous. Secondly applicants did not use the FINACLEAR resins mentioned by the reference in column 8,

Art Unit: 1714

line 25, which are used in the instant application. In a Declaration applicants have to use the formulation, which is the closest disclosed composition to applicants' composition, and said closest composition does not have to be one of the Illustrative Examples. Hellstern-Burnell et al. is cited only because they disclose applicants' claimed molecular weight. Burnell et al. show both transparent and opaque compounds in their disclosure, and selection of either, would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made.

9. Langer 4,254,775, entitled "Implantable Defibrillator and Package Therefor", cited on PTO Form 1449, has not been considered, since it is clearly irrelevant to the instant invention.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Szekely whose telephone number is (703) 308-2460. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 a.m.-5:30 p.m. Tuesday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (703) 306-2777. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Application/Control Number: 10/064,262
Art Unit: 1714

Page 5

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Peter Szekely', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Peter Szekely
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1714

P.S.
August 6, 2003